



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/379,753	08/24/1999	MICHAEL N. GRIMBERGEN	3948/USA/SIL	1675

32588 7590 01/23/2004

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.
2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, RUDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

29

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-29

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/379,753

Applicant(s)

GRIMBERGEN, MICHAEL N.

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-14,23-30,33,35-42,44-51 and 57-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-14,23-30,33,35-42,44-51 and 57-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 12, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 61 and 63 are objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant has two different sets of lettered outlines: (a)-(d) and (a)-(c). For clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the second outline set to, for example, (i)-(iii). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-4, 11-14, 30, 33, 35, 37-39, and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giapis et al (USPat. 5,002,631) in view of Piwonka-Corle (USPat. 5,608,526). Giapis teaches a substrate etching apparatus (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 9-21) comprising a chamber (100) including:

- i. A substrate support (110) to support a substrate (120)
- ii. A gas distributor (102) to introduce an etchant gas into the chamber
- iii. A gas energizer (140; column 3, lines 61-68) to energize the etchant gas

Art Unit: 1763

iv. A gas exhaust (103) to exhaust gas from the chamber

Giapis further teaches non-plasma radiation laser sources (161, 162), one of which (161) emerges from the chamber. Giapis further teaches one or more detectors (164, 165) to detect an intensity of a first radiation originating from the radiation source(s) and reflected from a substrate (120) or a chamber wall and generate sample signals (column 4, lines 40-49, 18-30).

Inclusive, Giapis teaches:

- i. A sample detector / first reference detector (164) to detect a first reference radiation from the plasma and generate a first reference signal ("systems...based on measurements" - column 4, lines 18-30). Applicant's additional requirement of "wherein the first reference radiation comprises a background radiation" is an intended use requirement. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter , 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02). Further,
- ii. A reference detector / second reference detector (165) to detect a second reference radiation (161) from the radiation source (161) and generate a second reference signal ("systems...based on measurements" - column 4, lines 18-30).

Giapis further teaches the detection (163) of an intensity of a second radiation (162) emitted from the radiation source and generate a reference signal (column 4, lines 40-49) at the second

Art Unit: 1763

detector (163). Giapis further teaches the uniformity of wavelength between the first radiation reflected from the substrate and the second radiation (from the source 162) as per the “bifurcated fiber bundle 166” detected by one monochrometer detector 163. The depth an uniformity of Giapis’ etch are monitored by laser scattered by the wafer (column 5, lines 20-23).

Giapis does not teach:

- i. a signal analyzer adapted to normalize the sample signal relative to the reference signal by mathematically operating on the sample signal with the reference signal to generate a normalized signal, and determine a thickness of a layer being etched on the substrate or chamber wall from the normalized signal

Piwonka-Corle teaches an ellipsometry apparatus (Figure 12) for substrate analysis (column 3, lines 9-20). Specifically, Piwonka-Corle teaches:

- ii. a signal analyzer (100; column 15, lines 9-23; Figure 12) adapted to normalize the sample signal (9) relative to the reference signal (“reference beam”) by mathematically operating on the sample signal with the reference signal to generate a normalized signal (“is programmed to normalize”), and determine a thickness of a layer on a substrate from the normalized signal. It is inherent that Piwonka-Corle’s signal analyzer normalization apparatus compensates for fluctuations in reflected radiation and background radiation. Specifically, Piwonka-Corle teaches that the signal analyzer (100; column 15, lines 9-23; Figure 12) is programmed to normalize (column 15, line 15) specifically for “intensity fluctuation” compensations (column 15, line 18). Inclusive, that Piwonka-Corle teaches background radiation compensation during signal processing is supported by Piwonka-Corle’s very

Art Unit: 1763

teaching of polychromatic collection and monochromatic analysis of said specific sample radiation signal, i.e. wavelength (column 11, line 60 – column 12, line 8).

Applicant's claim 61 claim limitations of:

“

(a) before the gas energizer energizes the etchant gas, measuring the sample and reference signals,

(b) after the gas energizer energizes the etchant gas but before substantially etching has occurred, measuring the sample signal, and

(c) during etching, measuring the sample and reference signals, whereby a thickness of a layer being etched on the substrate or chamber wall” are requirements of intended use of the claimed apparatus claims. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter , 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP 2111.02).

Applicant's claim 62 claim limitations of “the background radiation comprises...”, and the entirety of claim 63 are requirements of intended use of the claimed apparatus claims. See above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Giapis to use Piwonka-Corle's signal analyzer to determine a thickness of a layer on a substrate from the normalized signal.

Art Unit: 1763

Motivation for Giapis to use Piwonka-Corle's signal analyzer to determine a thickness of a layer on a substrate from the normalized signal is to determine film thicknesses more accurately (column 15, lines 10-15).

5. Claims 6-10, and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giapis et al (USPat. 5,002,631) and Piwonka-Corle (USPat. 5,608,526), in view of Cates et al (USPat. 5,328,517). Giapis and Piwonka-Corle are discussed above. Giapis and Piwonka-Corle do not teach a signal analyzer that performs the normalization by assigning a specific mathematical algorithm for the normalization.

Cates teaches an apparatus for removing material from a substrate (column 3, lines 21-44). Cates further teaches a similar photodetecting system and associated components (column 3, lines 44-65). Specifically, Cates teaches:

- iii. a signal analyzer (148; column 15, line 44 – column 16, lines 10) adapted to normalize the sample signal ("signals received in each data channel") relative to the reference signal (18'; Figure 8; column 15, lines 60-68) by mathematically operating (column 18) on the sample signal with the reference signal to generate a normalized signal (column 16, lines 5-10)
- iv. a signal analyzer that performs the normalization by assigning a specific mathematical algorithm for the normalization (column 18, lines 30-45)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Giapis and Piwonka-Corle to reprogram Piwonka-Corle's signal analyzer in the manner of Cates' signal analyzer that performs the normalization by assigning a specific mathematical algorithm for the normalization.

Art Unit: 1763

Motivation for Giapis and Piwonka-Corle to reprogram Piwonka-Corle's signal analyzer in the manner of Cates' signal analyzer that performs the normalization by assigning a specific mathematical algorithm for the normalization is to generate Cate's weighted sum average (column 18, lines 24-43).

6. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giapis et al (USPat. 5,002,631) and Piwonka-Corle (USPat. 5,608,526), in view of Taketora Saka (JP01260304). Giapis and Piwonka-Corle are discussed above. However, Giapis and Piwonka-Corle do not teach a lens to focus the reference radiation from the radiation source onto the first fibers. Taketora Saka shows a lens (6) in Taketora Saka's Figure focusing radiation between the reference radiation (3) and the substrate (1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Giapis and Piwonka-Corle to use Taketora Saka's lens to focus the reference radiation from the radiation source onto the first fibers.

Motivation for Giapis and Piwonka-Corle to use Taketora Saka's lens to focus the reference radiation from the radiation source onto the first fibers is drawn to the level of ordinary skill in the art whereby lens optics are known to focus, i.e. concentrate, light rays thereby increasing the radiations intensity to a small area.

7. Claims 40-51, and 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Giapis et al (USPat. 5,002,631) in view of Ish-Shalom et al (USPat. 6,299,346). Giapis is discussed above. However, Giapis does not teach a feedback controller adapted to regulate a power level of the radiation source in relation to the detected intensity of the second radiation. Ish-Shalom teaches fiber optic (24, Fig.2a) spectroscopy of a wafer (10). Ish-Shalom additionally

Art Unit: 1763

teaches a chamber (14) comprising an electro-optical shutter (23) modulated (column 10, lines 40-45) radiation source (28), first (32) and second (34) detectors for detecting an intensity of a first radiation reflected (column 9, lines 20-39) from a substrate and the detection of an intensity of a second radiation from the radiation source. Specifically, Ish-Shalom teaches a feedback controller (36) adapted to regulate a power level (column 11, lines 8-15) of a reference radiation (28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Giapis to use Ish-Shalom's feedback controller adapted to regulate a power level of a reference radiation.

Motivation for Giapis to use Ish-Shalom's feedback controller adapted to regulate a power level of a reference radiation is to allow correction for electronic drifts (column 11, lines 1-18).

8. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Giapis et al (USPat. 5,002,631) and Ish-Shalom et al (USPat. 6,299,346) in view of Piwonka-Corle (USPat. 5,608,526). Giapis and Ish-Shalom are discussed above. However, Giapis and Ish-Shalom do not teach

- v. a signal analyzer adapted to normalize the sample signal relative to the reference signal by mathematically operating on the sample signal with the reference signal to generate a normalized signal, and determine a thickness of a layer being etched on the substrate or chamber wall from the normalized signal

Piwonka-Corle teaches an ellipsometry apparatus (Figure 12) for substrate analysis (column 3, lines 9-20). Specifically, Cates teaches:

Art Unit: 1763

- vi. a signal analyzer (100; column 15, lines 9-23) adapted to normalize the sample signal (9) relative to the reference signal ("reference beam") by mathematically operating on the sample signal with the reference signal to generate a normalized signal ("is programmed to normalize"), and determine a thickness of a layer on a substrate from the normalized signal

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Giapis and Ish-Shalom to use Piwonka-Corle's signal analyzer to determine a thickness of a layer on a substrate from the normalized signal.

Motivation for Giapis and Ish-Shalom to use Piwonka-Corle's signal analyzer to determine a thickness of a layer on a substrate from the normalized signal is to determine film thicknesses more accurately (column 15, lines 10-15).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed March 13, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. Applicant's argument of the Piwonka-Corle reference that "these lamp intensity fluctuations and air currents are fluctuations in the reflected radiation from the radiation source." Is addressed above. Specifically, Piwonka-Corle teaches background radiation compensation during signal processing is supported by Piwonka-Corle's very teaching of polychromatic collection and monochromatic analysis of said specific sample radiation signal, i.e. wavelength (column 11, line 60 – column 12, line 8).

11. Applicant's remaining arguments are each directed to the context of the claim amendments. In response, the Examiner directs Applicant to the body of the newly rejected claims above.

Art Unit: 1763

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (571) 272.1442. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official after final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9311. The official before final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9310. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (703) 308-0661. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills, at (571) 272-1439.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rudy Zervigon", with the date "1/16/14" written below it.